Date: Sat, 4 Jun 94 03:30:51 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #621
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest   Sat, 4 Jun 94   Volume 94 : Issue 621

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 3 Jun 94 16:25:09 -0600
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!pacbell.com!sgiblab!darwin.sura.net!atlas.tntech.edu!
jmg@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Cancun repeaters
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

anyone know of any repeaters in Cancun?

73

Jeff, AC4HF

Date: 4 Jun 94 05:22:28 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!

nntp.cs.ubc.ca!alberta!ve6mgs!usenet@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Daily Summary of Solar Geophysical Activity for 03 June
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

/\

DAILY SUMMARY OF SOLAR GEOPHYSICAL ACTIVITY

03 JUNE, 1994

/\

(Based In-Part On SESC Observational Data)

SOLAR AND GEOPHYSICAL ACTIVITY INDICES FOR 03 JUNE, 1994

NOTE: Electron fluence at greater than 2 MeV was at high to very high levels.
Background x-ray flux was below A1.0.

```
!!BEGIN!! (1.0) S.T.D. Solar Geophysical Data Broadcast for DAY 154, 06/03/94
10.7 FLUX=068.3  90-AVG=082        SSN=000      BKI=3432 2334  BAI=016
BGND-XRAY=A1.0     FLU1=1.3E+05  FLU10=1.2E+04  PKI=4433 3334  PAI=019
  BOU-DEV=033,064,033,013,019,021,034,042   DEV-AVG=032 NT     SWF=00:000
 XRAY-MAX= B1.0   @ 1548UT    XRAY-MIN= A1.0   @ 2323UT   XRAY-AVG= A2.4
NEUTN-MAX= +001%  @ 1840UT   NEUTN-MIN= -003%  @ 1710UT  NEUTN-AVG= -0.4%
  PCA-MAX= +0.2DB @ 1555UT     PCA-MIN= -0.4DB @ 2230UT    PCA-AVG= +0.0DB
BOUTF-MAX=55341NT @ 0005UT   BOUTF-MIN=55290NT @ 2003UT  BOUTF-AVG=55314NT
GOES7-MAX=P:+000NT@ 0000UT   GOES7-MIN=N:+000NT@ 0000UT  G7-AVG=+079,+000,+000
GOES6-MAX=P:+145NT@ 1800UT   GOES6-MIN=N:-092NT@ 0339UT  G6-AVG=+107,+035,-035
 FLUXFCST=STD:070,070,070;SESC:070,070,070 BAI/PAI-FCST=020,020,020/025,020,020
    KFCST=3334 4333 3334 3332  27DAY-AP=040,036   27DAY-KP=6665 4343 5565 4344
 WARNINGS=*GSTRM;*AURMIDWRN
   ALERTS=
!!END-DATA!!
```

NOTE: The Effective Sunspot Number for 02 JUN 94 is not available.
The Full Kp Indices for 02 JUN 94 are: 4- 4- 4- 4o 3o 3o 3o 3o
The 3-Hr Ap Indices for 02 JUN 94 are: 25 21 25 30 15 16 15 16
Greater than 2 MeV Electron Fluence for 03 JUN is: 1.2E+09

SYNOPSIS OF ACTIVITY

Solar activity was very low. No significant activity was observed the past 24 hours. The disk remains spotless.

Solar activity forecast: solar activity is expected to be very low.

The geomagnetic field has been at quiet to active levels for the past 24 hours. Energetic electron flux (GT 2 MeV) ranged from moderate to high levels over the past 24 hours.

Geophysical activity forecast: the geomagnetic field is expected to be mostly quiet to active for the next three days.

Event probabilities 04 jun-06 jun

Class M	01/01/01
Class X	01/01/01
Proton	01/01/01
PCAF	Green

Geomagnetic activity probabilities 04 jun-06 jun

A. Middle Latitudes	
Active	25/25/25
Minor Storm	20/20/20
Major-Severe Storm	10/10/10

B. High Latitudes	
Active	20/25/25
Minor Storm	20/15/15
Major-Severe Storm	20/15/15

HF propagation conditions continued below-normal over the high and polar latitude regions, but improved over the last 24 hours. Middle latitude paths have been near-normal. Additional night-sector substorm activity could continue to sporadically degrade high and polar latitude paths. General fading levels are above-normal over most regions, but signal qualities are not significantly degraded except at times for transauroral circuits. Conditions should continue to gradually improve over the next 3 days, through 06 June inclusive.

COPIES OF JOINT USAF/NOAA SESC SOLAR GEOPHYSICAL REPORTS

REGIONS WITH SUNSPOTS. LOCATIONS VALID AT 03/2400Z JUNE

NMBR	LOCATION	LO	AREA	Z	LL	NN	MAG TYPE
7728	S07W66		322				PLAGE

REGIONS DUE TO RETURN 04 JUNE TO 06 JUNE
NMBR LAT LO
NONE

LISTING OF SOLAR ENERGETIC EVENTS FOR 03 JUNE, 1994

BEGIN	MAX	END	RGN	LOC	XRAY	OP	245MHZ	10CM	SWEEP
NONE									

POSSIBLE CORONAL MASS EJECTION EVENTS FOR 03 JUNE, 1994

BEGIN	MAX	END	LOCATION	TYPE	SIZE	DUR	II	IV
NO EVENTS OBSERVED								

INFERRED CORONAL HOLES. LOCATIONS VALID AT 03/2400Z

ISOLATED HOLES AND POLAR EXTENSIONS

	EAST	SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	CAR	TYPE	POL	AREA	OBSN
83	S60E36	S60E36	S40W90	S30W14	288	EXT	NEG	091	10830A
85	N10E71	S20E46	S20E46	N10E71	195	ISO	POS	013	10830A

SUMMARY OF FLARE EVENTS FOR THE PREVIOUS UTC DAY

Date	Begin	Max	End	Xray	Op	Region	Locn	2695 MHz	8800 MHz	15.4 GHz
NO EVENTS OBSERVED.										

REGION FLARE STATISTICS FOR THE PREVIOUS UTC DAY

	C	M	X	S	1	2	3	4	Total	(%)
Uncorrellated:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	000	(0.0)

Total Events: 000 optical and x-ray.

EVENTS WITH SWEEPS AND/OR OPTICAL PHENOMENA FOR THE LAST UTC DAY

Date	Begin	Max	End	Xray	Op	Region	Locn	Sweeps/Optical Observations

NO EVENTS OBSERVED.

NOTES:

All times are in Universal Time (UT). Characters preceding begin, max, and end times are defined as: B = Before, U = Uncertain, A = After. All times associated with x-ray flares (ex. flares which produce associated x-ray bursts) refer to the begin, max, and end times of the x-rays. Flares which are not associated with x-ray signatures use the optical observations to determine the begin, max, and end times.

Acronyms used to identify sweeps and optical phenomena include:

II	= Type II Sweep Frequency Event
III	= Type III Sweep
IV	= Type IV Sweep
V	= Type V Sweep
Continuum	= Continuum Radio Event
Loop	= Loop Prominence System,
Spray	= Limb Spray,
Surge	= Bright Limb Surge,
EPL	= Eruptive Prominence on the Limb.

** End of Daily Report **

Date: 4 Jun 94 01:41:34 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!uchinews!news@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: General Class Testing in Chicago???
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

David M. Barley
dmbarley@midway.uchicago.edu
University of Chicago

I am now a student here in Chicago (originally from California). I recieved my Novice Class when I was 12, about five years ago. Now that I am a little older--ok, so a lot older--I can understand the material for the General and higher classes. I know a lot has changed in terms of the classes, but i am sure that the General Class still exists--right? What I would like are some names of stores that carry HAM stuff, like manuals and equipment and study guides and morse code tapes, etc. I live in Hyde Park and have not seen anything around here. Also, what places around here offer courses and opportunities to take the different tests.

I would appreciate e-mail since it is much easier for me to get! Thanks in advance!

Dave
KB6NER

Date: Fri, 3 Jun 1994 20:49:04 GMT
From: newsgate.melpar.esys.com!melpar!phb@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Legal Protections for Hams
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

pegood@ss3.magec.com (Peter E. Goodmann) writes:

>On a VERRRRRY loosly related subject, how about eliminating the
>"industrial exemption" clause in your state's engineering registration law?
>These exemptions, which most if not all states have, allow unlicensed
>"engineers (who may not even have any engineering education or experience)
>to practice as engineers as long as they only design manufactured goods. Would
>you allow an unlicensed physician, who can only kill one person at a time to
>practice medicine? How abount an unlicensed automtive "engineer" who could
>kill many people with a single mistake?

One of the arguments against this suggestion is that a PE license is no guarantee that an engineer will do safe, quality engineering work and never make a mistake. All the industrial exemption does is allow a company to accept responsibility for its products in lieu of an individual employee (i.e., engineer). Therefore, the employee does not require a license and the company assumes all responsibility for ensuring that he/she is properly trained and all liability if he/she designs a poor or unsafe product which is a danger to the public welfare.

On the other hand, the private engineering practitioner must have a license because he/she is directly responsible when something goes awry. But regarding physicians, even licensed physicians sometimes make mistakes, so what does the license prove? It doesn't prove competence, it merely proves that the individual had, at the time of licensing, enough knowledge to be judged competent by a review board. But "being judged" competent isn't the same as actually "being competent."

What about the fact that, in many states, a PE license makes NO REFERENCE to the particular engineering discipline which is the licensee's field of competence? Does this mean that a PE who's area of expertise is EE can sign off on a blueprint for a bridge because he/she is a PE? If that's true, I'd rather put my trust in a company that someone waving a piece of paper.....

No flames intended here, BTW; in fact, I agree that a PE license is a good and useful thing. I fear, however, that industry and some of the professional societies have conspired to create a situation whereby "going back" to licensing all engineers will be impossible to achieve. If only one state does it, then industry will just pack up and move to a state that doesn't do it (and be welcomed with open arms!). Ergo, it would be necessary to create a national law (Ugh! Just what we need!) requiring that all engineers be licensed; otherwise, it will never happen.

The first three pargraphs above are sort of "Devil's Advocate" statements which probably only scratch the surface of arguments which would rear up in opposition to your suggestion.....

* Paul H. Bock, Jr. K4MSG * Senior Systems Engineer
(|_|) * E-Systems/Melpar Div. * Telephone: (703) 560-5000 x2062
| |) * 7700 Arlington Blvd. * Internet: pbock@melpar.esys.com
* Falls Church, VA 22046 * Mailstop: N301

"Imagination is more important than knowledge." - Albert Einstein

---

Date: Fri, 3 Jun 1994 22:08:51 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!news1.oakland.edu!rcsuna.gmr.com!kocrsv01!
news@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Legal Protections for Hams
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In <Cqtq3s.Fu1@ss3.magec.com>, pegood@ss3.magec.com (Peter E. Goodmann) writes:
> [...]
>On a VERRRRRY loosly related subject, how about eliminating the
>"industrial exemption" clause in your state's engineering registration law?
>These exemptions, which most if not all states have, allow unlicensed
>"engineers (who may not even have any engineering education or experience)
>to practice as engineers as long as they only design manufactured goods. Would
>you allow an unlicensed physician, who can only kill one person at a time to
>practice medicine? How abount an unlicensed automtive "engineer" who could
>kill many people with a single mistake?
>

I'm not very comfortable with the concept of "licensing" people to do work.

If somebody is good at programming and I think that person is capable and responsible, I should be able to get computer programs from that person regardless of whether a license to practice has been issued.

(Now change computers to people and read that paragraph again:)

If somebody is good at medicine and I think that person is capable and responsible, I should be able to get medical care from that person regardless of whether a license to practice has been issued.

However, I'd be very happy if some trustworthy organization had a set of standards for "certifying" people. If my doctor friend were certified by, say, the A.M.A. as a capable general practicioner, that would be great. Imagine the A.M.A.'s "public service" announcements: "Make sure you're being treated by an A.M.A.-certified physician!" Malpractice insurance providers could base their rates on levels of certification.

And the S.A.E. could certify people as skilled automotive engineers without some regulatory body preventing "unlicensed" people from working. A company might choose not to hire an "uncertified worker", but government regulations shouldn't have to enter into it.

==
Alan Anderson || If they put a bunch of cattle in orbit,
(Ham Radio WB9RUF) || would it be the herd shot 'round the world?
My views may not necessarily be those of Delco Electronics or its management.

Date: 3 Jun 1994 16:17:46 -0700
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!
sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!ornews.intel.com!
ornews.intel.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: RFD:Radio repair rip-off??
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun3.170147.18537@news.yale.edu> revco@YALE.EDU (Jim Revkin) writes:
>I'd like to get the groups opinion. Keep in mind while I know some
>radio theory, I'm no repair person. Question: I decided to try
>to get my original transceiver a Kenwood TS 520 back on the air.
>In trying to tune up, there was basically no power output. So I
>left it off a a local repair shop and told the owner I though it might
>well need new finals and alignment. He charged me a $45 "bench fee"
>which would not be refundable but would be credited toward the repairs,
>and bascially sat on the set for a couple of weeks...
stuff deleted...
>   Perhaps I should have been more "aware" of the potential for losing
>my money. My questions are: (1) shouldn't I have expected them to
>have at least opened the set up for the $45; (2) could the repairs
>really be expected to get into that range, assuming the worst.

Yes and Yes. But you did accept the non-refundable terms when you left the set. If I were you I just wouldn't go back there again.
The last time I looked, it was $75 in this area just to take a looksee for an estimate. In the repair business an "estimate" often involves indentifying the problem which is really most of the work. Many consumer customers will complain about a $100 repair bill to replace a 10 cent capacitor. They don't give a rat's rear that it may have taken hours of troubleshooting to find the bad part. If the repair technician is good enough to find bad capacitors in a couple of minutes then they can and will make more money somewhere well away from consumer electronics.
All repair shops now seem to have some kind of gestation period before they will even look at something. 2-3 weeks is minimum usually. This and the high prices should convince hams that it is well worth the trouble to at least try fixing something themselves. Hams are especially lucky because most rigs, new and used, come with schematics and even well written circuit descriptions and repair/alignment procedures. Other consumer electronics is getting very hard to find documentation for. The manufacturers will tell you that the information is proprietary and you either send it to their repair station or junk it.
The moment you bring your rig to a repair shop you cross the line from experimenter/tinkerer to a full fledged appliance operator. Go ahead and try to fix it. Its probably not the tubes or alignment if there is no transmitter output at all. Check the driver stage for output first and work your way back to the oscillator from there. Oh, and check for all voltages present of course.

--
zardoz@ornews.intel.com WA7LDV

Date: 3 Jun 1994 16:31:02 -0400
From: newstf01.cr1.aol.com!search01.news.aol.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Software
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I was wondering if anyone has a copy of software, to connect a mac to a HAM radio. I had heard about some Apple 2 programs for sale but I was looking for a shareware or other type of mac program. Any help is appreciated

Thanks,
Jeff

Date: 4 Jun 94 05:40:11 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!nntp.cs.ubc.ca!alberta!ve6mgs!usenet@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: WARNING: Potential Satellite Anomaly Warning (first post failed)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

/\

POTENTIAL SATELLITE ANOMALY WARNING

ISSUED: 04:00 UT, 03 JUNE

/\

ATTENTION:

Energetic electrons at greater than 2 MeV have climbed back to high fluence levels. Over the last month, electrons at these energy levels have spent more time at high levels than in previous months. During the period from about 15 May to the end of May, electrons had fallen back to near-normal levels, but continued to peak at moderate to high flux levels. We presently appear to be experiencing another recurrent enhancement in activity that has persisted for each solar rotation since early this year. High to very high fluences are expected over the next week or two and may be followed by periods of moderate to high fluence levels thereafter.

** End of Warning **

Date: 4 Jun 94 05:10:58 GMT
From: agate!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!ccnet.com!ccnet.com!not-for-mail@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994May31.192311.19181@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, <1994Jun2.141129.18271@cs.brown.edu>, <2sl510$lbh@tadpole.fc.hp.com>
Subject : Re: Ham Radio few problem

John Schmidt (jws@fc.hp.com) wrote:
: Mike,

: > If someone knowingly takes steps to key a repeater, even though
: > they have been told not to, then that is intentional interference.

: Can you support this statement by other than your own opinion, if the
: attempted usage of the repeater is not malicious?
: I would be very interested in any case where the FCC has held that attempting
: to use a repeater is considered "malicious interference". My personal
: contention is that PL today is not an access-restriction mechanism -- almost
: all new rigs include encoders and many open machines require PL to reduce
: interference from other services keying the repeater.

OK lets take this to the next step. Most technically proficient amateurs
today can decode touch-tone signals that are broadcast on the input
frequency. Most of you will now agree that touch-tone is no longer an
access-restriction for controlling or functioning an amateur repeater.
Surely by punching in the correct sequence on a touch-tone pad found on
any radio you are now controlling the repeater. You might even be able to
use the repeater for third party traffic. Where do you draw the line?

If PL is not an access restriction in the historic and common sense then
touch-tone is not sacred.

: > However, we're not speaking simply of actions, we're also speaking of
: > intent. Someone may choose to operate simplex on my repeater input,
: > and use the same PL as I have on my machine because it happens to be
: > the same as one they use elsewhere. Does this become intentional
: > interference?

: A good question, and I would be interested if you have any evidence from
: the FCC's rulings to support your contention that attempting to use the
: repeater is interference. According to the FCC, as you've already stated,
: there really is no such thing as "open" or "closed" repeaters. Anyone can
: shut off their repeater to anyone else. Where we differ is on the issue of
: whether it's malicious interference to try to operate within the rules on a
: "closed" machine that readily responds to all users (or all users with the
: proper PL).

Why do you want to shut off or deny the repeater group their pleasure?
Please remember that the repeater or 40 meter net is on a fixed
frequency. Your station has the ability to change frequency or bands at
the flick of the wrist. The Commission has ruled at length on these
issues in the many cases that have plaged nets and repeaters.

John, your intent is showing...have you forgotten the rule about good
amateur operating practice? This is the catch all... ;)

Bob

--

     Bob Wilkins   work   bwilkins@cave.org
 Berkeley, California   home   rwilkins@ccnet.com
     94701-0710   play   n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.noam

Date: 3 Jun 1994 17:27:41 -0500
From: illuminati.io.com!nobody@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <9405271209.AA14552@maverick.aud.alcatel.com>,
<2s5sl8$ihu@illuminati.io.com>, <2sni5o$f8s@newsworthy.west.sun.com>yon1.
Subject : Re: IDing

In article <2sni5o$f8s@newsworthy.west.sun.com>,
Fred Lloyd [Phoenix SE] <flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com> wrote:
>
>
>>Don't say "73s" or "73's" It's "73".
>
>OK. All those who care please hold up your hands....
>
>
Would you get annoyed if I called you "Freed" or "Frad"?
You might know what I mean, but it's annoying.

>Oh. So you're a professional whistle blower and this is just another
>game for you. Well, guess what, it's fourth quarter and most of the
>audience has already left the stadium. Not many will hear, or care,
>about your next call.
>
>
Then why give a damn in the first place?
Contradiction. I fail to see your point.

>
>Welcome to amateur radio.
>
>
Well, then, I'll be anal, too. Why, if we're all anal and
act like we're the sole authority on amateur radio practice,
just think what we can do to standardize thing!
And, if we ever have an emergency and ham radio is needed
to make an autopatch call, I"ll just do it my way.

>
>There's a big difference here. For starters, there is no rule anywhere
>that states that any of the above mentioned practices are illegal.

>Granted, they may be unsavory, but they're legit. For example, you can
>note that a linebacker is ugly, but you can't flag him for it. It's
>just not in the rules. You just shrug your shoulders and go on about
>your business.
>
I never said they were illegal. Conformity helps.
Standardized amateur practices make it easier to understand
the next guy. But, since it's obvious the majority of old timers
think it's okay to do it any old way they damned well feel like it,
I will stop bothering to do things the way I was taught.

Listen to repeaters from different cities. Notice how different
they are when they talk? God knows what I'm gonna hear on repeater
142.xxx. When I say "KB8SGL monitoring", I might very well hear
"KB8SGL, how nice for you. Call CQ on this repeater, please"
Yes, diversity and chaos. How sweet it would be.

>Have a nice day. And remember, it's a Hobby!
>
Yep. It's a hobby.

Regulated by the government.

And since they can't figure things out, I'll stop trying.

--
....
Matt Rupert | 2984 Pheasant Run Drive Apt D | Jackson, MI 49202 | (517) 782-1438
        Security - Organization Meetings/Bookings - Professoinal Harasser
                  UNIX / Amateur Radio enthusiast KB8SGL

Date: 4 Jun 1994 01:05:38 -0700
From: btree.brooktree.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2si4ff$q06@tymix.tymnet.com>, <2sid20$379@btree.brooktree.com>,
<2sn2im$63l@nyx10.cs.du.edu>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <2sn2im$63l@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,
Jay Maynard <jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu> wrote:

>Fairness is never moot. Changing the rules and destroying people's investments
>is never fair.

The world and the rules are constantly changing. No denying y'all were pioneers up on 440, but now the settlers are here and we want chit-chat channels for our 1/2 hour commutes. Maybe it's time to move on to the new frontier; that's what pioneers do!

>Jammed any repeaters lately?

No, we use jelly now.

--

Roger Bly
roger@brooktree.com

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #621
****